DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 083 957 JC 730 253

AUTHOR	Wattenbarger, James L.; And Others
TITLE	The State Directors of Community Junior Colleges and Their Staffs: A 1973 Reexamination.
INSTITUTION	Florida Univ., Gainesville. Inst. of Higher Education.
PUB DATE	73
NOTE	38p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrative Personnel; *Administrator Background; *Administrator Characteristics; Chief Administrators; Community Colleges; Junior Colleges; Questionnaires; Staff Role; *Surveys

ABSTRACT

A study to provide an empirically based conceptualization of the state directors of community junior colleges and their staffs was conducted. A questionnaire to provide information on the administrators was mailed to the state directors of 48 states. Questions concerned the length of time the director had been in office, the place where the directors received their degrees, the data about the position held just prior to appointment as State Director, salary ranges, accountability, most frustrating jobs, and long term professional goals of the directors. The second part of the questionnaire was directed toward a descriptive view of the staff. Information was sought regarding staff size, age ranges of the state staff, vocational backgrounds of staff members, titles of staff members, working relationships, committees within the staffs, and the make-up of the staffs. (CK)

ED 083957

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE STATE DIRECTORS OF COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGES AND THEIR STAFFS: A 1973 REEXAMINATION

By

James L. Wattenbarger
Frank Lagotic
Willis Holcombe

Institute of Higher Education
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida

Fall, 1973

JC 730 253

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Institute of Higher Education-Univ. of Fla.
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

Copyright, 1973

Institute of Higher Education
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida 32601

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword v

Section I: Introduction and Method of Inquiry 1

Section II: The State Director 3

Section III: The State Level Staff 13

Section IV: Appendices 20

A. The Questionnaire 21

B. Alphabetical List of Responding States . 27

C. Growth Patterns of State Level Staffs .. 28

D. Titles of Various State Level Staff Positions 29

FOREWORD

As the end of 1973 approaches it has become evident that soon all 50 states will include in their systems of higher education provisions for the two year college. While the development of community colleges as a specific organizational model is not universal, more states use that structure than any other one. It also may be observed that trends in structure seem to indicate that most states find the comprehensive community college to be the best answer for providing opportunity for Post Higher Education to all. Recent developments in South Carolina, Georgia, Tennessee, Kansas, Wyoming as well as other states which did not have community colleges of a truly comprehensive nature until the 1970's indicate the confidence which has come to be placed upon this two year structure of post high school education.

These recent developments have invariably resulted in a recognition of the need for stronger leadership and a more active role for the state level agency. Commissions on Higher Education, Departments and Divisions of Community Colleges, State Community College Boards have begun to be established more and more often. This report is a status survey of the professional staffs of such agencies. It may be compared with similar reports issued in 1969 and 1970 by

the Institute of Higher Education at the University of Florida. The reader may wish to compare the reports to note the changes which have occurred. These are a part of a series of reports carried out at the request of the National Council of State Directors of Community Colleges with funds from a grant supported in part by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation.

I am indebted to the research carried out by Frank Lagotic and Willis Holcombe, Kellogg Fellows at the University of Florida in preparing this report. I am also indebted to my colleague, Dr. Louis W. Bender, at Florida State University who shares with me the directorship of this Center, a partnership arrangement between two state universities. We particularly appreciate the excellent cooperation from the state directors who provided the information reports herein.

James L. Wattenbarger, Director
Institute of Higher Education
University of Florida

Fall, 1973

SECTION I

Introduction and Method of Inquiry

The purpose of this study is to provide an empirically based conceptualization of the State Director of community junior colleges and their staffs. Although the position of state director has been in existence since 1928, most of the present offices have been created in the last fifteen years.[1] The pace of development evident in recent years has left little time for reflection on how much progress has been made. Now that the rapid growth period for community junior colleges is over, the need for assessment is more apparent.

The first step in evaluating performance is to identify as precisely as possible what has been done. Ostensibly that may appear to be an easy task, but there is a hidden challenge. It is not enough merely to chronicle what the various states have done in establishing state level coordination, but we must search for commonalities. These commonalities, where they can be identified, will be more useful in identifying trends than uninterpreted data. The authors recognize that drawing generalizations is more intellectually hazardous than just reporting facts and accept the implied risks in doing so. The attempt is always to remain faithful to the original data obtained from the various states by questionnaire.

[1]C. Wayne Hall. "The Status of the State Officer Responsible for Junior College Education." Junior College Journal, 38 (March, 1968).

The questionnaire (Appendix A) was formulated at the Institute of Higher Education, University of Florida expressly for this project. The first half of the instrument pertains directly to the chief administrator and the second to his staff. In June, 1972, after several revisions and a limited field test copies of the questionnaire were mailed to the state directors of 48 states. Compilation of the data began in late October and continued through the end of November. By that time 39 replies had been received. The states that replied represent 693 community junior colleges or approximately 80 percent of the national total.

It is important to bear in mind, as one observes the data, that each state is a unique and separate entity. The individuality of these systems is not stressed in the data due to the commitment to interpret the data by generalizing. The states are not identified in the data since the purpose is not to single out states for special attention. In this matter, it is hoped that this document will be useful to current state directors, to states who are in the process of hiring directors and staffs, and to states that are going to be creating these positions for community junior colleges.

SECTION II

The State Director

The State Director, as he will be referred to throughout this report, is not known by that name in most states. Five states use that title, but five others report that their title is President and another five indicate Executive Director. The titles- Chancellor, Executive Secretary, Director and Vice Chancellor - are each used in three states to designate the chief state level administrator of community junior colleges. Vice President and Associate Superintendent are titles used in two states. One state each uses the following titles; Assistant Director, Executive Dean, Branch Director and Coordinator.

As might be inferred from the titles, not all of these offices have equal authority or responsibility. The title of Chancellor, for example, is usually more inclusive and involves larger responsibility than other offices. Director, Executive Director, President and State Director appear to have relatively equal prestige and authority. The other titles for the chief administrator seem to be somewhat subordinate in comparision. These subordinate titles are usually found in states having relatively small state community junior college systems. These administrators often do not have as direct lines of communication to the top higher education officials and must deal through intermediaries.

Four states that responded indicated that they had no state director or staff. Consequently they will not be reflected in the description data on the state director or the staff. Each of these states had fewer than three community junior colleges in their system and indicated that the small number of institutions was a major factor in not having a state administrative office. Some of the institutions in these states are considered two-year public university branches and fall under the governance of the university system.

Responses to the question on the length of time that the Director had been in office were surprising. The following chart summarizes the data.

Time	No. of Directors
less than 1 year	8
1 year	10
2 years	6
3 years	4
4 years	2
5 years	1
6 years	0
7 years	3
8 years	1
9 years	0
10 years	0
11 years	1
12 years	1

As the chart indicates 18 of the state directors had occupied the position for a year or less. Two explanations appear plausible. First, state systems of community junior colleges are relatively new creations. It could also be that the nature of the job is such that individuals do not wish to occupy such positions for any great length of time. Whatever

the explanation, it is obvious that in many cases state directors have been in office a short period of time. The two replies of eleven and twelve years came from individuals charged with statewide higher education responsibilities, not just community junior colleges. This fact adds even more credence to the conclusion that the state director has been on the job for a relatively short period of time.

The educational backgrounds of the state directors indicate that there are several trends in the preparation required for the job. Twenty-six of the thirty-four respondents to the question held the doctoral degree (Ph. D-9 Ed.D.-16, J.D.-1). Seven held a Masters or equivalent and only one director held the Bachelors as his highest degree. The individual that held the Bachelors had studied for his doctorate, bypassing the Masters, but had not completed it. The trend is decidedly toward having a doctorate degree in the director's chair. Sixteen of the respondents received their highest degrees since 1962. This does not necessarily mean that these directors have had only a few years experience, however, as many people who pursue graduate degrees do so on a part-time basis or after they have worked for several years.

Educational administration dominates the majors that the state directors took while they were in graduate school. Over half of the state directors listed educational administration as their major. This stands in contrast to administrators in University and 4-year colleges systems who usually have majors

in particular subject areas. Aside from education administration, there is great diversity among the other fields that the directors chose for their majors.

Where did the directors get their degrees? The answer to this question indicates that no school or group of schools has a monopoly.Of the thirty-nine replies, 27 different institutions were listed. The University of Florida and the University of Illinois each had graduated three state directors and headed the list. Only two other schools, Teachers College, Columbia and University of Oregon, had state directors among their graduates. The rest of the state directors came from schools all over the United States and there is no trend evident in the data. Some institutions are attempting to change this picture by developing programs especially pointed at developing state level leadership. As a result, the situation could be quite different in a few years.

The data about the position held just prior to appointment as State Director reveals a few interesting points.

Position Held	No. of Directors
State Level Administrative Position	
1. Related to Community Junior Colleges	10
2. Related to Higher Education	4
Four Year College Teaching/Administrative Position	8
Community College President	4
Private Business - Executive Position	3
President Four Year Institution	2
Community Junior College Administrator (Excluding Presidents)	2
Ph. D. Candidate	1

As might be expected the most direct route to the state director's chair is through a state level administrative position. However, after that category, the most common source is the four-year institution. Presidents, administrators, and teachers from four-year schools account for nearly 30 percent of the state directors who responded to this question. Obviously experience in some form of higher education is advantageous in gaining both experience and connections.

In an attempt to gain further insight into the director's previous job experience he was asked to list other positions held by him during his professional career. As expected, teaching and administrative experience at all levels was the most prevalent. Curiously more of the directors had experience in the secondary schools and in the four-year colleges than in the community colleges. Perhaps this reflects the late emergence of the community college in many states. The time spent in previous jobs averaged from 2 to 5 years for each position. The implication here is that in order to be considered for a state directorship a broad base of experience is desirable.

The state directors were asked to rate what experiences they thought were the best preparation for their job. Three types of experience emerged as the most valuable:

	No. of Directors
1.University, Community College, General Administrative Experience	19
2.Teaching, Supervision experiences	12
3.Doctoral Study	8

Surprising to some perhaps is the fact that doctoral study was rated among the most valuable experience. It is important to note that experience within the field of education, in any capacity can provide valuable experience for the potential chief administrator.

The age range for state directors shows a rather even dispersion:

Age	No. of Directors
Under 30	0
30-34	4
35-39	5
40-44	4
45-49	9
50-54	6
55-59	5
60 and over	1

There seems to be no ideal age for a state director as long as he fits the needs of the system. This wide dispersion of ages could very well reflect the diversity of the various state systems - both in organization and in magnitude of operation.

The salary ranges reported indicate a vast difference in the compensation which the various state directors receive. The questionnaire failed to discriminate among the directors who earned more than $30,000 annually. The upper limit should have been higher to better define the upper brackets. The following chart shows the responses:

Annual Salary	No. of Directors
Less than 12,500	0
12,501 - 15,000	1
15,001 - 17,500	3
17,501 - 20,000	4
20,001 - 22,500	3
22,501 - 25,000	0
25,001 - 27,500	4
27,501 - 30,000	7
More than 30,000	11

The salary levels further indicate that there is a great variance in the responsibility and scope of the individual state offices. The fact that the state directors, on the average, earn a salary comparable with college presidents suggests that some prestige also accompanies the position.

Fringe benefits were difficult to identify and compare so the most valuable way to look at them is to present the most common benefits. The following list is provided along with the numbers of directors that receive them and the range of benefits if applicable:

Benefits	No. of Directors	Ranges
Home or Housing Allowance	3	$0 to $250/month
State Retirement	35	$68.75/month to
with Social Security	26	1/2 salary/month
Insurance		
Medical	24	Partial to full
Life	17	coverage
Disability	13	
Accident	8	
Consulting Time Limits	17	10 days annually to no limit
Vacation	35	10 days annually-40 days annually
Sick Leave	34	10 days annually-2 days/month
Sabbatical	8	1/4 to 2/3 full pay 1/2 yr to full year 2/3 pay
Funds for Entertainment	7	"limited to $300/mo
Parking Privileges	14	

University Privileges	
Library Use	2
Football Tickets	1
Basketball Tickets	1
Miscellaneous	
Tuition for children at state Colleges	1
Automobile	1
- For business use only	1
- Car Allowance $1,400/year	1

Although some items are common to most directors (retirement, vacation, sick leave) the allowances and diversity are wide ranging. To some extent the scope of fringe benefits is determined by the size, prestige, and length of service in the particular community college system.

In trying to determine to whom the state directors are responsible, the questionnaire failed to make a clear distinction between a board for higher education and a state board of education. Thus the data suggests a duality when in many cases the board of higher education may be under the administrative control of a state board of education.

Responsible to:	No. of Directors
Director of Higher Education or State Board	17
Commission Chairman, Chancellor of Education	13
President of higher education system	3
Director of Vocational, Continuing Education	3

In the cases where state directors report to vocational or continuing education directors, there are two categories:

1) In some states the community colleges developed

as an outgrowth of vocational or technical institutes. Then the state level administrative control has remained in these areas.

2) Most community colleges have some vocational, technical and continuing education program responsibilities. As a result the state directors report jointly to the vocational/technical state administrators and to the state board for all education or to the state board for higher education.

To the open-ended question about what the state directors spend most of their time doing, a high level of agreement was achieved. Thirty-one responses indicated that meetings with various agencies occupied most of their time. The major types of meetings listed under these responses were with colleges, legislature, planners and other coordinators. Other functions that appeared in a lesser degree were public relations, policy foundation , correspondence and preparing reports. The extent to which some of these tasks would occupy the director's time would depend on the level of development of the whole system.

Answers to the questions that pertained to the most rewarding and most frustrating tasks that the directors must perform were interesting There seemed to be a higher degree of convergence on the rewarding tasks than there was on the frustrating ones.

Most Rewarding	No. of Directors
Working with Community Colleges and Universities	14
System Planning and Development	11
Working with State Board/Trustees	5
Working with Legislature	4
Public Relations	3
Managing and Supervising	3
Policy Adoption and Drafting	2

Most Frustrating	No. of Directors
Bookkeeping and Budget	8
Lack of Authority to Change or Initiate	7
Red Tape, Beauracracy	3
Lack of Institutional Appreciation	3
System Planning and Development	3
Working with State Board/Trustees	3
Working with Legislature	3
Working with Community Colleges and Universities	3
Policy Adoption and Drafting	2
Dealing with Controversial Educational Issues	2
Processing and Securing Personnel	2
No Frustrations	2

Besides the drudgery of bookkeeping and budget preparation the state directors surprisingly indicated that lack of authority was the most frustrating part of their job. Evidently state directors feel they need and want more power over their programs. This response could be a result of the continuing conflict between the individual college's desire for autonomy and the need for state planning and coordination.

The long term professional goals expressed by the state directors reflect a high degree of commitment to their present position. Thirteen respondents expressed a need for more staff to keep up with the growth of the system and the demand on the central office. Seventeen directors answer that it was their goal to improve the state community junior college system and do the best job that they know how with the present resources. On the other hand, thirteen directors stated that they would like to return to a community college or university in either a teaching or administrative capacity. Four directors indicated a desire to enter politics and two cited retirement as their goal.

SECTION III

The State Level Staff

The second part of the questionnaire is directed toward a descriptive view of the state level staff. The purpose of this portion of the survey was to gain information about the staff from the same states that returned information about the state director. That rationale lead to the inclusion of the two parts in the same instrument. However, the returns on the staff portion were not as good as on the first part. Several factors may have contributed to this fact. First, the questions may have been so imprecisely stated that they confused the respondent. Also, some of the information asked for may not have existed and may have been difficult to generate. It became evident as the returns came in that in some cases the two parts of the questionnaire had been separated and sometimes the staff portion did not make it back.

The result of this apparent confusion is that only 31 replies of the original 48 sent out were returned. To further complicate the matter, many of the forms returned were only partially filled out. On some questionnaires whole pages were skipped, on others just particular items were omitted. Also, there were some answers that had to be eliminated due to a misunderstanding of the question. These factors affect the validity and generalizability of this whole portion of the survey. Thus the reader will find that the statements in this

section are more qualified and less sweeping in nature. Despite these problems the information presented here can still be of use. Rough parameters and trends can be identified about the state staffs and as such are valuable. The reader should remember, however, that these influences are drawn on data that is approximately 60 percent complete.

The size of the state staff, both professional and non-professional, varies greatly from state to state. The range of professional staff is from 0 to 46 people with a mean of 10.5. Non-professional staff ranges from 1 to 35 with an average 8.4. The broad range in both categories makes any kind of generalization impossible. However, it is difficult to conceive of a state office charged with the coordination of a statewide system of community colleges operating without any staff as was reported by one respondent.

Growth pattern information is summarized in the chart included as Appendix C. It is interesting to note that only one staff existed in 1957. This points up how recently these staffs have been developed. Generally, there has been growth in the size and number of staffs in the last fifteen years. Since 1970, there have been a few reductions, but it is difficult to determine whether this is due to an organizational change, relocation, or any other single course.

The age ranges of the state staff are listed below, but represent only seventeen states. Others either did not answer the question or were confused by it:

Age	No. of Professional Staff
less than 30	10
30-34	18
35-39	24
40-44	28
45-49	23
50-54	18
55-59	2
over 60	2

There is a fairly even age spread up to age 55. There are only four staff members 55 years old or older. This statistic may reflect the newness of state staffs.

The previous experience of the members of the staff indicates that there is a heterogeneity here that is missing in the state director's office.

Experience	No. of Professional Staff
State Level Administration	25
University	33
Junior College	25
Vocational	20
Business	19
Industry	11

The surprising number of staff that had vocational background indicates that some states have a relatively strong state vocational technical program at the junior college level.

Most of the staff were recruited from higher education institutions found within their own state. Over two-thirds of the staff members listed came from that source or from some other state agency closely allied with education. A few came to their jobs through referrals and advertising, but only one staff member came to his job through the state level personnel office.

Nearly one-half of all the professional personnel recorded was classified under Civil Service classifications or some similiar state structure. This was expected for the non-professional staff, but not for the professional. Perhaps, the low number of respondents in this category has skewed the distribution toward the positive response. Very few non-professional staff were not under some standard system of classification.

The titles of various state staff positions are listed in Appendix D. There are a great number of variations in titles and they reflect the varying degrees of responsibility covered by the role incumbent. Generally, the titles are listed the headings of services performed at the state level office. This selection of positions and titles could serve as a guide for developing a new state level staff from a functional point of view.

Respondents indicated that there are state staff needs that are not currently authorized. The implication in the magnitude of these needs is that the growth of the staff may not be keeping pace with the growth in the overall system. This data also may indicate only type of "dream sheet" submitted in hopes of a positive reaction.

Needs	No. of Positions
General Administration	11
Research	9
Student Personnel	8
Academic Affairs	6

Finance	4
Public Relations	3
Vocational, Technical, Adult Education	2
Community Services	1
Engineering	1
Legal	1

This type information could be especially helpful to those institutions that purport to training people for positions at the state level. The main reason for these positions not being filled or authorized is money. Budgetary restrictions were blamed in nearly every case for the shortage of professional staff.

The working relationships that exist in the state level staff largely determine what the flow of information will be. The responses to this survey indicate that many staffs use more that one channel to exert influence on the individual schools. Twenty-one states answered that their staff worked through their counterparts in the institutions. Some staff work through the Community Collge Presidents as shown by eighteen positive responses in that category. The greatest number of states (26) reported that their staff worked with standing councils or committees. One logical extension of this data would be that different people on the staffs probably work in the manner that they feel they can be most effective. This would mean, then, that the personnel, not the organizational chart, determines the channels of communication. Is this really any different than any other organizaiton?

Since it was anticipated that the state staffs would be required to work through many standing committees, a breakdown of the types of committees was asked for. The following chart ennurmerates the various groups with which the staff frequently works:

Committees	No. of Staffs
Presidents Council	17
Business/Finance	15
Academic Affairs	10
Student Affairs	8
Association of Community Colleges (State)	7
Vocational, Adult, Technical Education	7
Faculty Council	5
Trustee Associations	3
Articulation Committees	3

State staffs also must work closely with other state level agencies that share responsibility for public programs of all types. State Budget officials head the list of state agents that are involved. The obvious conclusion here is that fiscal concerns are of upmost importance to the state staffs. The Councils of Higher Education, State Departments of Education and Vocational/Technical Departments are the next three agencies reflected in the data. Others mentioned were the Board of Health, the Legislature, the Governor's office, and the Board of Regents or Association of Community Colleges. Frequent dealings with agencies outside of the field of education make it imperative that state staff personnel be able to project a favorable image. All too often decisions are made on programs in accordance with the impression that the individuals made when the proposal was presented.

Perhaps the most clear-cut data was obtained on the last question of the form. The make-up of the staff was easy to determine and all of the respondents filled in the appropriate totals.

	BLACK	WHITE	ORIENTAL	SPANISH	INDIAN	TOTAL
MALE	5	344	13	1	1	364
FEMALE	4	99	4	3	0	110
TOTAL	9	443	17	4	1	474

These figures clearly indicate that affirmative action programs could well be applied to the state level staffs. The recruitment of trained blacks and women in the next several years would help to eliminate the current imbalance.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

State Directors of Community Colleges

1. What is the current title of the position you hold?

_____

How long have you been in this position?_____

2. Professional Background:

A. Educational:

1) Highest degree held_____

2) Institution_____

3) Year received_____

4) Major area_____

5) Minor area_____

B. Experience:

1) Position held immediately previous to your current position. _____

H How long in that position?_____

2) Other positions held

Positions (include company,univ.)	Years of Service
a._____	_____
b._____	_____
c._____	_____
d._____	_____
e._____	_____

3. Personal Data:

A. Age (check one)

Under 30	_____	40-44	_____	55-59	_____
30-34	_____	45-49	_____	60 & over	___
35-39	_____	50-54	_____		

4. Job Information:

A. Annual Salary (check one)

under $10,000	____	20,001-22,500	____
10,000-12,500	____	22,501-25,000	____
12,501-15,000	____	25,001-27,500	____
15,001-17,500	____	27,501-30,000	____
17,501-20,000	____	over 30,000	____

B. Fringe Benefits (If possible include approximate amounts)

Home or housing allowance _____

State retirement _____

with Social Security _____

Insurance-Medical _____

Life _____

Disability _____

Accident _____

Time for consulting _____

limits _____

Vacation time _____

Sick leave _____

Sabbatical _____

Parking privileges _____

Funds for entertainment _____

Privileges at universities
(i.e. football tickets,etc.)

Other (please explain) _____

_____

5. Please enclose a job description (if available).

6. What areas of your responsibility do you find

   A. Most rewarding _____

   _____

   B. Most frustrating _____

   _____

7. What do you spend most of your time doing?

   _____

   _____

   _____

8. What do you think in your background provided you with the most valuable preparation?

9. What are your long-term professional goals?

10. To whom are you directly responsible?

State Level Staffs for Community Colleges

Please enclose any printed or mimeographed materials relative to staff.

1. How many staff positions are directly under the supervision of the state director? Professional _____

   Non-professional _____
   (secretarial, clerical, etc.)

2. Pattern of new positions--How many each year?

Year	Professional	Non-Professional
Fall, 1971	_____	_____
Fall, 1970	_____	_____
Fall, 1969	_____	_____
Fall, 1968	_____	_____
Fall, 1967	_____	_____
Fall, 1962	_____	_____
Fall, 1957	_____	_____

3. Age Ranges (How many in each category?)

Under 30	_____	40-44	_____	55-59	_____
30-34	_____	45-49	_____	60 & over	___
35-39	_____	50-54	_____		

4. Previous Experience (How many in each category just prior to present employment? Some may be a combination)

   Other state level _____

   Higher Education (senior college or University) _____

   Junior College _____

   Vocational school _____

   Business _____

   Industry _____

   Armed Services _____

5. When a vacancy occurs, where do you usually recruit new staff members?_____

_____

6. Are these positions classified under civil service or similar ratings?

Professional _____ Non-professional_____

7. If the printed enclosures do not include the following information, please list:

A. Titles of current positions

1)_____
2)_____
3)_____
4)_____
5)_____
6)_____
7)_____
8)_____
9)_____

B. Salary Range

1)_____
2)_____
3)_____
4)_____
5)_____
6)_____
7)_____
8)_____
9)_____

C. Educational Requirements:

Minimum	Desired
1)_____	1)_____
2)_____	2)_____
3)_____	3)_____
4)_____	4)_____
5)_____	5)_____
6)_____	6)_____
7)_____	7)_____
8)_____	8)_____
9)_____	9)_____

8. If printed enclosures do not include it, please enclose a diagram showing current staff relationships on a separate page.

9. What staff needs do you have for which positions are not currently authorized?

10. If staff positions remain unfilled or are difficult to fill, can you tell why? Which positions fall into this category?

11. Do state staff work with counterparts in the community colleges directly _____? through the college president _____?

12. Are there standing councils or committees with which state staff members work? Yes _____ No _____

Name them: (e.g. Presidents Council)

_____

_____

_____

_____

13. What other state level agencies does the state staff relate to in a regular manner?_____

_____

_____

_____

14. How many of the professional staff are:

	Black	White	Other (please identify)
Men	____	_____	_____
Women	____	_____	_____

APPENDIX B

Below are listed, in alphabetical order, the states that responded to the questionnaire:

Alabama
Alaska
Arizona
Arkansas
California
Colorado
Connecticut (Community Colleges)
Connecticut (State Technical Colleges)
Delaware
Florida
Georgia
Hawaii
Idaho
Illinois
Iowa
Kansas
Kentucky
Maryland
Massachusetts
Mississippi
Missouri
Montana
Nebraska
Nevada
New Jersey
New Mexico
New York
North Carolina
North Dakota
Ohio
Oklahoma
Oregon
Rhode Island
South Carolina
Tennessee
Utah
Washington
Wisconsin
Wyoming

APPENDIX C

Growth Patterns of Community College State Level Staffs

STATES	1957		1962		1967		1968		1969		1970		1971	
	Prof	Non-Prof	Prof	Non-Prof	Prof	Non-Prof	Prof	Non-Prof	Prof	Non-Prof	Prof	Non-Prof	Prof	Non-Prof
1					3	4	1	0	1	3	0	2	0	4
2					1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
3					6	4	1	2	⟨3⟩	⟨1⟩	4	3	⟨7⟩	⟨8⟩
4			2	5	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	1	0
5					0	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	7	13
6			1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1
7									2	2	2	1	2	2
8							44	13	2	2	0	0	0	1
9													1	1
10			1	3	5	3	2	4	1	1	1	2	0	0
11				1		1		1	8	2	8	3	5	1
12					3	5	1	1	0	0	3	1	⟨1⟩	0
13					4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
14					4	3	0	0	⟨1⟩	0	0	0	0	0
15									10	3	⟨5⟩	⟨1⟩	0	1
16					1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
17					1	0	1	2	2	⟨2⟩	0	2	2	0
18			1	1	0	0	1	0	1	1/2	⟨1⟩	⟨1/2⟩	0	0
19	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	1	2
20													1	1
21			1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
22							10	10	0	0	⟨1⟩	⟨1⟩	⟨1⟩	0
23							1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
24							1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
25											1	1	1	1
26					1	1	2	0	1	0	1	1	1	1
27											2	1	1	0
28									0	0	0	0	1	1
29					1	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0
30					23	25	3	3	3	5	0	0	⟨1⟩	⟨3⟩

* (Number added or ⟨lost⟩ each designated year)

** Columns left blank indicate state staff was not in existence

APPENDIX D

Titles of Various State Level Community College Staff Positions

I Positions Reporting and Responsible to Director

Assistant to the President
Vice President - Assistant Vice President
Vice President Administration and Education
Assistant Director
Coordinating Director
Assistant Division Director
Associate Executive Director
Executive Assistant
Administrative Assistant
Vice Chancellor (3)
Assistant to the Chancellor (3)
Assistant Chancellor - Administrative Service
Executive Officer
Associate for/Assistant Executive Secretary
Deputy Executive Secretary
Administrative Officer
Director of Procedures
Associate University Dean
Dean of Administrative Affairs
Assistant Dean Administration and Management

II Business and Finance

Director of Budget and Finance
Director of Business
Business Manager (2)
Fiscal Director
Fiscal Analyst-Assistant
Fiscal Affairs Officer
Research Assistant Fiscal Affairs
Director of Finance and Administration
Budget Analyst
Associate Director of Finance and Budget
Assistant Director of Business Services
Coordinator of Accounts and Audits
Accounting Assistant
Purchasing Agent
Inventory Specialists

III Curriculum

Curriculum Evaluator
Specialists Curriculum Programs
Assistant Dean of Curriculum
Assistant Director of Curriculum and Instruction
Director of Curriculum
Education Program Specialists
Director of Education Program
Program Officer
Supervisor of Programs
Programs Director
Dean of Academic Affairs
Vice Chancellor Academic Affairs
Associate Director of Baccalurate Programs

IV Planning and Development

Education Planner
Coordinator of Planning
Coordinator Program Planning and Development
Specialists Facilities Planning
Coordinator Research and Program Planning
Specialists Planning and Student Services
Associate Executive Officer-Development and Administrative
Coordinator Faculty and Institutional Development
Statistican
Coordinator Federal Programs
Special Projects Planner

V Services

Coordinator Student Services (2)
Associate Director-Student Services
School Services Specialists
Coordinator of Community Services
Director Community College Services
Industrial Services
Education Services

VI Vocational, Technical, Occupational, Adult

Director Technical Education
Assistant Director Vocational Education
Associate Director Occupational Programs
State Director Vocational Education
Associate Director Adult Education
Career Education Coordinator

VII Research

Director of Research
Research Assistant
Associate Director Research and MIS
Coordinator Academic Research
Coordinator Institutional Research

VIII Federal Programs

Manpower Services
Manpower Development
EPDA Coordinator
OEO Project Director

IX Computor

Director of Computor Center
Director of Information System
Programmer

X Relations with other Agencies

Assistant to Chancellor Legislative Liaison
Director School and College Relations
Interagency Relations

XI Miscellaneous

Director of Personnel
Public Relations
Engineer

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

NOV 30 1973

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

James L. Wattenbarger, Director